

SUMMARY OF THE DAY'S NEWS**The Weather.**

WASHINGTON, Jan. 17.—Forecast for Wednesday and Thursday—Partly cloudy Wednesday and Thursday; light south winds; North Carolina—Fairy Wednesday and Thursday; variable winds.

Richmond weather yesterday was clear and moderate.

RANGE OF THE THERMOMETER.

1 A. M.	41
12 M.	50
2 P. M.	50
3 P. M.	50
4 P. M.	48
12 midnight	49
Average	49 1/2

Highest temperature yesterday... 50
Lowest temperature yesterday... 29
Mean temperature yesterday... 40
Normal temperature yesterday... 42
Departure from normal yesterday... 2
Precipitation during past 24 hours... 0

MINIATURE ALMANAC.

Sun rises	7:21
Sun sets	4:18
Moon rises	2:11
Moon sets	2:32

January 18, 1905.

Redwood Lake given its third wash by Mr. E. D. Weber was taken from the water shortly after 8 o'clock yesterday morning—Governor Montague grants an reprieve little more than three weeks for McCue's execution for his part in a conspiracy to Supreme Court in counsel for condemned man—Baptist Council hears plans of commission for establishing a college for women in Virginia and a Richmond school for colored girls—Young Richmond girl detained in Baltimore at request of father Captain Tomlinson goes to Monumental City to bring her home—Chairman Agnew said to have made up his mind to resign at Saturday night's meeting—The most earnestly considerate matter of entering race for lieutenant governorship, and Friends believe he will certainly run. MANCHESTER—W. J. Dohring and Guy Clegg spent the night at Jackson's—Bessie Jones was married in Raleigh—Surprise marriage of Adolph Fritz and Ruby Thigle in Washington—Rev. J. J. Flaherty to go to Florida for his health.

Virginia.

Mrs. Mary Pitton Lewis, beautiful bride-elect of Winchester, dies in presence of her fiance from an operation on her womb. Her brother, Dr. George Pitton, surgeon, despatched by a freight train at Roanoke, near Suffolk—Four cases of smallpox in white families in Hanover county—The Jamestown stockholders meet at Norfolk to discuss carrying out ports of progress and stock sales—Col. Thomas Goode's will leaves a million, divided among his wife and children with a few special bequests—University Faculty Athletic Committee has been given a new name—The Anti-Saloon League in session in Lynchburg; suggestions for changes in the State liquor laws—The lawyers of Petersburg telegraph a petition to the President in behalf of Asa Rogers, a party leader in North New Jersey—a small craft Judge Waddell decides in the United States Court in Norfolk that the Pilots' Association may be sued collectively.

North Carolina.

House passes Senate bill prohibiting distilleries in Asheville of less than thirty-six gallons capacity from selling distilled spirits of death pronounced on Will Adams (colored) for murder—Old soldier dies in the poor house before he can be removed to the Soldiers' Home—First cremated remains ever buried in Asheville—Dr. Tyree strongly criticizes Dr. Abbott, editor of the Outlook.

General.

Understood that Republican members of investigating committee decide not to present Senator Smoot—Democrats to offer rate bill which may have some effect in railroads making up their legislative session of Congress—Cockrill makes his speech in House condemning New Orleans judge who opposed impeachment of Swaine—Senator Mitchell again brought forward his demand and denounces accusers—Diplomat's point out how Russian protest may bring about peace in Far East—Dr. Irvine files suit for libel against Bishop Talbot—Carnegie's protest—Oberlin professors succeeded in electing United States senator to succeed Cockrill—Fifty-one killed by avalanche in Norway—Two men killed and four others injured in Indiana accident—racism at New Orleans and other sporting news.

of appeal to this honorable court, where human life is at stake, and a fair opportunity of being heard at its bar by counsel, is one which, according to the theory, practice and traditions of the government of this Commonwealth, can be almost classed among the absolute rights of mankind.

If, indeed, the grounds upon which such right is based are not well founded, or if one should have already been adjudicated and settled by this court, after full argument, against the contention of the applicant, then, under the theory of our law, he must bear the expense and not suffer the dignity and authority of the court to be trifled with.

But where the matter relied upon is material to the conduct and defense of his cause, without regard to his condemnation, and where the correctness and regularity of the judgment complained of is in good faith called in question, and the cause has been submitted to the test of the judicial scrutiny of this court, after full argument at its bar, and which, in fact, engrosses the serious consideration of the court, then, so far as large, refusal to hear argument is the denial of a right within the contemplation of the "law of the land."

The undoubted right of an accused person to the benefit of counsel is as intrinsically a right as any other which the court is influenced in rendering its decision.

It may be that, in the estimation of the court, the right to a trial by jury, as hereinafter set forth, is as important as the right to be heard by counsel, but the question is when human life is at stake, ought the court, however inclined to it be, and however obscure the cause, to allow the accused to be tried without counsel?

It is impossible in any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test of a fair and full opportunity of combating them, when the case presented in several important aspects, in one of first importance.

It is impossible for any such case as petition for counsel, however diligent, to anticipate the difficulties which will arise in the mind of the court, in respect to the propriety of the question of the trial by jury, and the question itself, as to the right to a trial by jury, is a question which, in my judgment, should be left to the discretion of the court.

It is also impossible for the court to

know whether the accused has been subjected to the test